

PRYOR CASHMAN SHERMAN & FLYNN LLP

410 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4441

GIDEON CASHMAN
PAUL J. SHERMAN
DAVID L. AUERBACH
ALAN H. SIEGEL
STEPHEN F. HUFF
JOSEPH Z. EPSTEIN
SANFORD M. GOLDMAN
HOWARD SIEGEL
JAMES A. JANOWITZ
ARNOLD J. SCHAAB
STEPHEN B. RODNER
SELIG D. SACKS
DONALD S. ZAKARIN
STEPHEN M. GOODMAN
RONALD H. SHECHTMAN
ANDREW H. BART

PHILIP R. HOFFMAN EDWARD A. MORGAN RONALD B. KREMNITZER RICHARD L. KAY ERIC B. WOLDENBERG LAWRENCE REMMEL RICHARD M. BETHEIL ERIC M. HELLIGE TOM J. FERBER JAMIE M. BRICKELL **BLAKE HORNICK** KAREN M. ROBSON JOSEPH L. GRIER JOHN P. NAPOLI WAYNE B. HEICKLEN CHRISTOPHER J. SUES

PETER D. WOLFSON
CAROLE NEVILLE
WILLIAM M. LEVINE
JOHN J. CROWE
BRAD D. ROSE
PERRY M. AMSELLEM
STEPHEN G. EPSTEIN
ARTHUR H. RUEGGER
RICHARD S. FRAZER
STEVEN J. PIERCE
KENNETH A. SCHULMAN
BRETT J. MEYER
JEFFREY L. LAYTIN
LISA M. BUCKLEY
STEVEN L. CHUDNOW

MARC A. KUSHNER MARK W. SAKS COUNSEL: IRA J. GOLDSTEIN F. ROBERT STEIN W. WILDER KNIGHT

F. ROBERT STEIN
W. WILDER KNIGHT, II
STEVEN M. RABINOWITZ
JAMES S. O'BRIEN, JR.
ROGER E. KASS
SAMSON R. BECHHOFER
RICHARD B. VERNER
MITCHELL C. STEIN
JONATHAN A. BERNSTEIN
JEFFREY C. JOHNSON

TELEPHONE: 212-421-4100

FAX: 212-326-0806

EMAIL: FIRM@PRYORCASHMAN.COM WWW.PRYORCASHMAN.COM

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL:

212-326-0417

WRITER'S EMAIL:

nmiller@pryorcashman.com

July 12, 2001

07-13-2001

U.S. Patent & TMOfc/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #74

ς Γ

VIA EXPRESS MAIL (EE642896505US)

Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks 2900 Crystal Drive Arlington, VA 22202-3513 Attn: Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

RE: Opposition No. 122,816 to the

Mark RUSH NEW MEDIA, Ser. No. 75/741,795

Dear Sir/Madam:

In connection with the above-referenced opposition proceeding, enclosed are the following documents:

- 1. Answer to Counterclaims; and
- 2. A self-addressed return postcard.

Please acknowledge receipt of the enclosed materials by placing your receiving date stamp on the enclosed postcard and returning it to our office.

Thank you.

Sincerely

Nicole E. Miller Attorney for Opposer Russell Simmons

Enclosures

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

| In the Matter of Trademark Application Serial No. 75/741,795 for the mark RUSH NEW MEDIA | | | 07-13-2001 U.S. Patent & TMOfc/TM Mail Rept Dt. #74 | | | | |
|--|------------|---|--|------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | Russell Simmons, | | : | |
| | | | | | | : | |
| C | opposer, | : | | | | | |
| | | : | Opposition No. 122,816 | | | | |
| -against- | | : | | | | | |
| | | : | | | | | |
| Kerry Colin Keane, | | : | | | | | |
| | | : | | | | | |
| Α | Applicant. | : | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | |

ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS

Opposer Russell Simmons ("Opposer"), by his attorneys, Pryor Cashman Sherman & Flynn LLP, as and for his Answer to the counterclaims asserted in the Answer to Notice of Opposition ("Answer") filed on behalf of Applicant Kerry Colin Keane, respectfully responds as follows:

- 1. Opposer lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth at Paragraph 25 of the Answer.
- 2. Opposer lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth at Paragraph 26 of the Answer, except admits that the United States Patent and Trademark Office's database lists Counterclaimant as the owner of the RUSH NEW MEDIA trademark application.

233834 v1

- 3. Opposer lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth at Paragraph 27 of the Answer.
- 4. Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 28 of the Answer.
 - 5. Opposer admits the allegations set forth in Paragraph 29 of the Answer.
- 6. With respect to the allegation set forth at Paragraph 30 of the Complaint,
 Opposer admits that Applicant has filed a baseless, unsupportable and totally frivolous
 counterclaim against Opposer seeking cancellation of Opposer's registration No. 2, 457,235, and
 Opposer respectfully refers the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board to Opposer's registration for
 a true and correct description of the goods and services set forth therein.
- 7. Opposer lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth at Paragraph 31 of the Answer.
- 8. Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 32 of the Answer, and further avers that: (i) Applicant's allegation of fraud is false and defamatory; and (ii) Applicant has failed to plead the alleged "fraud" with any particularity.
- Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 33 of the

 Answer.
- 10. Opposer lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations set forth at Paragraph 34 of the Answer, except admits that Opposer applied to register the RUSH MEDIA trademark on December 7, 1999 and that the United States Patent and Trademark Office's database cites June 30, 1999 as the filing date of Counterclaimant's application.

233834 v1

- 11. Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 35 of the Answer.
- 12. Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 36 of the Answer.
- 13. Opposer denies each and every allegation set forth at Paragraph 37 of the Answer.
- 14. Opposer (i) denies that Counterclaimant has any right to use, register and/or to expand the use of its RUSH NEW MEDIA trademark; (ii) denies that Counterclaimant will be damaged and/or injured by Opposer's Registration; and (iii) admits that Registration No. 2,457,235 may become incontestable after five years.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The counterclaims fail to state any claim upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant lacks standing to assert its claims.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant's assertions are barred by the equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, estoppel and/or acquiescence and unclean hands.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Counterclaimant has failed to plead its allegation of fraud with particularity and, as a result, the counterclaims must be dismissed.

WHEREFORE, Opposer respectfully requests that Opposition No. 122,816 be

granted in its entirety and that the counterclaims be dismissed in their entirety.

Dated: July 12, 2001

New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

Brad D. Rose, Esq.

Nicole E. Miller, Esq.

Pryor Cashman Sherman & Flynn LLP 410 Park Avenue New York, New York 10022 (212) 421-4100

Attorneys for Opposer, Russell Simmons

Certificate of Service by Express Mail

"Express Mail" mailing label No._

EEL42896505US

I hereby certify that this ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIMS is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail" service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on July 12, 2001, and is addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks, 2900 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513, ATTN: Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

Signed:

Name: